

REMARKS:

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-22 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 18-22 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-22 are now pending in this application.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to Figs. 1-2 and 4-5 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant continues to disagree with this objection. Nevertheless, in order to further prosecution, Applicant has amended the drawings in a manner believed to overcome this objection.

Section 103 Rejections

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of all of the pending independent claims under U.S.C. § 103 based on Bannai, U.S. Patent Number 5,412,486, in view of Kazumasa, J.P. Patent Number 10-066014. Applicant disagrees with these rejections, and submits the previous pending claims are patentably distinct over the proposed combination of references. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the pending independent claims to advance prosecution.

Applicant previously argued that none of the references teaches or suggests the “dynamic[]” extent determination as in claim 1. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner responded that “[s]electing the entire data or partial selection can both be an extent.” See Advisory Action. While Applicant disagrees that this teaches the “dynamic[]” extent determination, in order to further prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “the processing element is configured to fetch a dynamically-determined extent of the corresponding frame data for each of at least one of the frames in the video stream, including a first dynamically-determined extent of corresponding frame data for a first frame, **wherein the first dynamically-determined extent is less than the entirety of the frame data for the first frame**” (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references, and thus in condition for allowance. Independent claims 8 and

15 are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references (along with their respective dependent claims) for at least reasons similar to those provided above in support of claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-63700/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2008

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847